I am happy to report that, judging by its summary, Yaroslav Timofeyev's dissertation on Stravinsky's contributions to the Diaghilev version of *Khovanshchina*, first performed in June 1914, seems to be a sound and thorough piece of work. I was glad to revisit some sources that I had studied at the New York Public Library in 1983, the year in which the NYPL had temporary custody of the Stravinsky archive; and I was even gladder to learn of the existence of documents of which I was previously unaware.

The most noteworthy new document is the autograph particell of the final chorus that served the firm of Bessel as exemplar for its tiny edition of the piece, a score that has seen very little circulation. At the time of my own research this autograph score was still in the possession, it seems, of the estate of Grigory Furman, from whose heirs the Russian Federation's Ministry of Culture acquired it for deposit at the St. Petersburg theatrical museum. I had wrongly assumed that this document, which Stravinsky had sent to Vladimir Derzhanovsky, who sent it in turn to Nikolai Myaskovsky, before it was sent to the publisher, was an autograph full score. So that is one corrective that Timofeyev's work has to offer the existing literature. The autograph full score remains unlocated. When I was given the task of writing the essay to accompany the Vienna State Opera recording of *Khovanshchina*, conducted by Claudio Abbado, which uses the Stravinsky chorus, I wrongly assumed that they had used the score that either Serge Lifar or Boris Kochno had taken from Diaghilev's personal library at the time of the latter's death. I now know that the Vienna State Opera commissioned a reconstruction on the basis of the published Bessel particell and the sketchbook now at the British Library (formerly in the personal possession of Oliver Neighbour).

I was also very interested to note Timofeyev's identification of some sketches for Stravinsky's orchestration of Shaklovity's aria in the notebook otherwise given over to sketching the final chorus. I had missed these when I did my own investigation of the sketchbook, which Mr. Neighbour kindly showed me in May 1985.

Like Yaroslav Timofeyev, I was puzzled by the fact that the two incomplete autographs of Shaklovity's aria in Stravinsky's orchestration are in keys other than Musorgsky's original, and that they indicate incorrect transpositions. Timofeyev supposes that Stravinsky unknowingly worked from an already-transposed copy of Musorgsky's original. That is as plausible a supposition as any; but as I already noted in my monograph of 1996, there is no actual evidence to support it.

There is one supposition in Timofeyev's work with which I disagree. On the basis of a document he discovered in the Paul Sacher Stiftung, namely a prospectus of the Diaghilev London season for 1914, he writes that "it is possible to state that Khovanshchina was performed three more times in the British capital after the year of its première—1, 10 and 20 July 1914." These performances may have been planned and announced, but I do not think they could have actually taken place. There is an exhaustive chronicle of Diaghilev's London seasons: Nesta Macdonald, Diaghilev Observed by Critics in England and the United States 1911-1929 (New York: Dance Horizons and London: Dance Books, Ltd., 1975). Diaghilev's London premières, as listed on p. 112 of this book, included Daphnis and Chloe (Ravel), Papillons (Schumann), Le Coq d'Or (Rimsky-Korsakov), Le Rossignol (Stravinsky), Midas (Steinberg), La Légende de Joseph (Strauss) and La Nuit de Mai (Rimsky-Korsakov), but not Khovanshchina; nor are there any quotes from reviews of that opera, although reviews of all the other productions are copiously cited.

Timofeyev may wish to modify his statement about possible London performances of the Diaghilev *Khovanshchina* in 1914. Otherwise I find no fault at all with his work and I congratulate him on his achievement.

Rehard R Tarusku

Richard Taruskin

29 March, 2014